

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The application is directed to a water soluble package containing a detergent composition. The packaging and transport of water soluble packages containing fluid substances subjects the formed packages to considerable impact forces. A particular problem is that when a number of such packages are loose packed in a larger container which is then transported, the impact forces suffered by the packages within the container can be severe. The difficulty is that in such a situation it only takes one package in the larger container to break for the whole product to be ruined as far as the consumer is concerned because the fluid contents of the broken package may leak over any unbroken packages. Consumer confidence in a product is likely to be badly damaged by such an occurrence. The problem of minimising breakage to an acceptable level is particularly acute in the area of laundry detergents and other domestic consumer products and has not been solved until now. See page 2, line 24 - page 3, line 4 of the specification.

Applicants have surprisingly discovered that the above mentioned problems and disadvantages of known water soluble packages are substantially addressed by the packages according to the invention. In particular, the invention yields water soluble packages which are sufficiently robust to withstand (to a commercially acceptable level) the rigours of packaging and transport even when the fluid substance inside the package is a domestic consumer product such as a laundry detergent. The combination of thermoforming the packages of the invention and forming the packages into a dome shape confers surprising advantages on the packages of the invention. See page 3, line 26 - page 4, line 3 of the specification.

It is important that the body wall be thermoformed rather than cold formed because appellants have discovered that cold forming stresses the film and weakens the end package as a result. See page 4, lines 27-31 of the specification.

Claims 1-3, 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickler et al. (US 6,037,319) in view of Coleman (US 3,861,529).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Neither Dickler nor Coleman discloses dome-shaped packages. Rather Dickler specifically teaches rectangular shapes. See column 3, lines 24-37. Coleman teaches dimples in the film during the first step of the processing, but does not describe or show dome-shaped final packages. Rather, it is a "cylindricall upstanding wall portion merging into a concavity" (see claim 1). The covering film in Coleman is drawn "snugly" around the solid object; drawn into concavity formed by the dimples. See column 6, lines 16-21. Thus, the finished package probably looks like a shrink-wrapped product.

Furthermore, it is not seen how one of ordinary skill in the art who has not had the benefit of hindsight afforded by present disclosure, would have been led to combine the Dickler and Coleman patents. Coleman relates to plastic package, not water-soluble, for packaging solid objects. See column 2, lines 21-35 and column 6, lines 23-25. Dickler relates to water-soluble package holding liquids (see abstract, claims). There must be motivation in the art to combine the references. There is absolutely no suggestion in Dickler of either dome-shape or thermoforming and there is no suggestion in Coleman to use his process (which does not appear to produce dome-shaped packages) for water-soluble films holding liquids. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

It should also be noted that the Examiner has not pointed to any teachings in Dickler or Coleman with respect to the subject matter of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 10.

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and withdrawn and the application be allow to issue.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rimma Mitelman", written over a horizontal line.

Rimma Mitelman  
Registration No. 34,396  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa  
(201) 840-2671